



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,907	12/12/2000	Yasuhito Tanaka	P64537US1	6075

136 7590 02/10/2004  
JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC  
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.  
SUITE 600  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER
----------

HO, HA DINH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3681

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/733,907

Applicant(s)

TANAKA, YASUHIITO

Examiner

Ha D. Ho

Art Unit

3681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 4 and 16, 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8, 10, 11 and 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 10, 13 and 51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 23 April 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/102,557.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's Amendments filed on 12/04/03 and 12/16/03. Claims 5-7, 10 and 13 have been amended, claims 9, 12 and 14 have been canceled accordingly. Claims 5-8, 10-11 and 13 are currently pending in which claim 11 was withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 5 filed on 7/24/02.

2. Applicant is reminded to indicate the status of claim 11 being "withdrawn" instead of "Previously Presented" in the Amendment.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitations of "two roller bearings" recited in claims 7 and 13 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed

Art Unit: 3681

150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of using the implied phrase, i.e., "There is disclosed" in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The very first paragraph of the specification should be amended to indicate the updated status of the parent application 09/102,557 which has been patented, Patent No. 6,170,625, issued 01/09/2001.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 7 and 13 have been amended to recite the pulley unit comprising two roller bearings which was not described and shown.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5, 6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zettner et al (US 5,617,937) in view of Deppert et al. (US 5,330,393).

Regarding claims 5 and 10, Zettner et al'937 teach a pulley unit (see Fig. 1) having a free end (i.e., the left side) and a base end (i.e., the right side), comprising:

inner (2) and outer (1) concentric ring bodies that define an annular space there between; one-way clutch including a cam surface (13), a holder (4) defining a pocket (17), a roller (3), and an elastic member (18);

first and second roller bearings (6, 6) provided on both sides of the one-way clutch, one on the free-end side of the pulley unit (i.e., the left side) and another on the base end side of the pulley unit (i.e., the right side), wherein the first roller bearing is in form of a cylinder and in rolling contact with the outer surface of the inner ring body (2).

Zettner et al'937 do not show the second bearing being a ball bearing.

Using of a combination of a needle bearing and a ball bearing in a pulley unit is old and well known in the art. For example, Deppert et al'393 show a pulley unit (see Fig. 2) having inner (5) and outer (9) concentric ring bodies, a needle bearing (15) provided on the left side of the pulley (i.e., free-end side), and a ball bearing (11) provided on the right side of the pulley (i.e., base end side).

Art Unit: 3681

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a combination of a needle bearing and a ball bearing instead of two needle bearings on the pulley unit of Zettner et al'937 in view of Deppert et al'393, since using of a combination of a needle bearing and a ball bearing in a pulley unit is old and well known in the art. Further, replacing a needle bearing by a ball bearing is to prevent the inner ring body from moving axially.

Regarding claim 6, wherein the left roller bearing is in rolling contact with the inner surface of the outer ring body.

Regarding claim 8, wherein the roller (3) is cylindrically shaped.

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed 12/04/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues "in Deppert'393, a ball bearing and a one-way clutch are disposed in reverse order to the present invention" (page 8, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph).

Note that the modified pulley unit was made by looking at the teaching of Deppert'393, i.e., using a combination of a needle bearing and a ball bearing in the pulley unit, not by looking at the position order. Using the combination of the needle and ball bearings, the pulley unit can have a large load capacity while the axial movement of the pulley members would be prevented by the ball bearing.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, i.e., the axial

Art Unit: 3681

movement of the holder of the one-way clutch is restricted by the inner ring of the ball bearing (page 8, last paragraph), are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Conclusion***

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Communication***

12. Submission of your response by facsimile transmission is encouraged. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications. Recognizing the fact that reducing cycle time in the processing and examination of patent applications will effectively increase a patent's term, it is to your benefit to submit responses by facsimile transmission whenever permissible. Such submission will place the response directly in our examining group's hands and will eliminate Post Office processing and delivery time as well as the PTO's mail room processing and delivery time. For a complete list of

Art Unit: 3681

correspondence not permitted by facsimile transmission, see M.P.E.P. 502.01. In general, most responses and/or amendments not requiring a fee, as well as those requiring a fee but charging such fee to a deposit account, can be submitted by facsimile transmission. Responses requiring a fee which applicant is paying by check should not be submitting by facsimile transmission separately from the check. Responses submitted by facsimile transmission should include a Certificate of Transmission (M.P.E.P. 512). The following is an example of the format the certification might take:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to  
the Patent and Trademark Office on \_\_\_\_\_

(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

\_\_\_\_\_

(Signature)

If your response is submitted by facsimile transmission, you are hereby reminded that the original should be retained as evidence of authenticity (37 CFR 1.4 and M.P.E.P. 502.02). Please do not separately mail the original or another copy unless required by the Patent and Trademark Office. Submission of the original response or a follow-up copy of the response after your response has been transmitted by facsimile will only cause further unnecessary delays in the processing of your application; duplicate responses where fees are charged to a deposit account may result in those fees being charged twice.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Ho whose telephone number is (703) 305-0738. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Eastern Standard Time. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Charles Marmor, can be reached at (703) 308-0830. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.

*Ho Ho 02/09/04*

Ha Ho  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3681